

PAPER

THE PROCESS OF IMAGERY IN LEXICAL AND PHRASEOLOGICAL NOMINATIONS

Shadmanov Sherzod Xursanaliyevich^{1,*}

¹Assistant teacher at the faculty of foreign languages Kokand state university

* sherzodshadmanov5@gmail.com

Abstract

This article examines the process of imagery formation in lexical and phraseological nominations within the framework of modern linguistics. The study focuses on how imagery functions as a cognitive and semantic mechanism in the creation of lexical units and phraseological expressions. Particular attention is paid to the role of metaphor, metonymy, and cultural perception in shaping imagery-based nominations. The research employs descriptive, comparative, and contextual analysis methods to identify the semantic and expressive features of imagery in different language units. The findings demonstrate that imagery enhances expressiveness, emotionality, and cultural specificity of language, playing a crucial role in conceptualizing reality and reflecting the national worldview embedded in language. The results of the study may contribute to further research in semantics, phraseology, cognitive linguistics, and translation studies.

Key words: imagery, lexical nomination, phraseological units, metaphor, metonymy, cognitive linguistics, semantic analysis, linguistic worldview

Introduction

In modern linguistics, the category of imagery is considered one of the central concepts in explaining the semantic nature of lexical and phraseological units. In particular, the semantics of phraseological units, their nominative characteristics, and figurative mechanisms are interpreted in direct connection with the concept of “image.” However, the multidimensional, vague, and interdisciplinary

nature of the concept of “image” significantly complicates its investigation.

This concept is regarded as an important theoretical category not only in linguistic and psychological domains, but also within the framework of cognitive sciences. From a linguistic perspective, the interpretation proposed by V. Gak is of particular importance, according to which the semantic foundation of imagery is explained through the “combined

Compiled on: February 14, 2026.

Copyright: ©2026 by the authors. Submitted to *Advances in Science and Humanities* for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the [Creative Commons Attribution \(CC BY\) 4.0 license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

manifestation of two images.” This approach makes it possible to interpret imagery in the semantics of phraseological units not as simple reflection, but as the result of complex semantic reprocessing.

The relevance of the study arises from the need for a comprehensive analysis of the mechanisms of imagery in phraseological units through internal form, motivation, semantic heterogeneity, and processes of metaphorical and metonymic transfer. The aim of this article is to identify the mechanisms of formation of imagery in lexical and phraseological nominations, to reveal the interrelation between the concepts of internal form and motivation, and to scientifically substantiate the model of semantic reconceptualization of phraseological units.

Methods

The following methodological approaches were applied in the study:

Semantic analysis – to identify the figurative meanings of phraseological units and to describe their internal semantic structure;

Cognitive-linguistic approach – to explain imagery through world representation and conceptual models;

Component analysis – to determine the semantic functions of the components of phraseological units;

Structural-semantic method – to conduct a comparative analysis of the differences and common features of lexical and phraseological nominations;

Interpretative analysis – to interpret the mechanisms of internal form, motivation, gestalt, and semantic reinterpretation (reconceptualization).

The research material consisted of figurative phraseological units from English, Russian, and Uzbek, as well as scientific sources and theoretical concepts related to their semantic models. The study was conducted using comparative and analytical methods.

Results

The results of the study demonstrate that: Imagery in the semantics of phraseological units is not a simple referential reflection, but the product of complex semantic reprocessing. The representation of the world in phraseological units is formed not mechanically, but as a value-oriented conceptual model.

The internal form is the central component of the semantics of a phraseological unit, and it:

- appears as a condensed figurative model (gestalt) of the initial situation;

- enables figurative-associative perception of reality;

- functions as the motivating basis of phraseological meaning.

Motivation and internal form are not identical concepts:

- motivation is the mechanism that indicates the cause of the relationship between the planes of content and expression;

- internal form is the semantic-figurative expression of this very cause.

Figurative phraseological units arise as a result of the global reconceptualization of a free word combination and are formed as a condensed cognitive model of knowledge about the initial situation.

The process of deactualization is the main mechanism of phraseological reinterpretation, in which: thematic (concrete) semes are suppressed, abstract semes are activated, a new conceptual meaning is formed.

Example: The wheat is in bloom **Literal:** Wheat is in bloom (agricultural context)

Idiomatic: Things are flourishing; prosperity is emerging; development has begun.

Here, concrete agricultural semes are deactualized, while abstract semes such as “development,” “prosperity,” and “growth” become activated.

Discussion

The obtained results show that phraseological imagery differs from lexical imagery not in qualitative terms, but in its structural-nominative mechanisms. In lexical units, nomination is

predominantly direct, whereas in phraseological units indirect nomination prevails. This leads to the formation of imagery through complex semantic mechanisms.

The concept of internal form makes it possible to interpret phraseological units not only as semantic units, but also as cognitive models, conceptual structures, and gestalts. This indicates the necessity of analyzing phraseology not only within linguistics, but also within the framework of cognitive sciences.

In addition, the mechanisms of deactualization and reinterpretation were identified as central in the formation of phraseological meaning. These processes allow phraseological units to be evaluated as more complex cognitive phenomena than simple metaphorical transfer.

Conclusion

Imagery in phraseological nominations:

is the product of complex semantic reconceptualization;

is formed as a cognitive model through internal form;

is ensured by motivation as a mechanism of semantic linkage;

generates new meaning through the mechanisms of deactualization and reinterpretation. As a result, phraseological units function as a linguistic model of world representation, reflecting not only the communicative, but also the cognitive and conceptual functions of language.

References

1. Ammer, K. (2005). *Motivation in linguistic semantics*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
2. Astakhova, E. I. (2010). *Internal form of idioms and mechanisms of figurative meaning formation*. Moscow: Nauka.
3. Cherdantseva, T. Z. (2001). *Types of motivation in language and phraseology*. Moscow: URSS.
4. Gak, V. G. (1998). *Language transformations and the problem of imagery*. Moscow: Languages of Russian Culture.
5. Kunin, A. V. (1996). *Phraseology of modern English*. Moscow: Higher School Publishing House.
6. Kruglikova, L. E. (2003). *Semantic motivation in language*. Moscow: Nauka.
7. Potebnya, A. A. (1976). *Thought and language*. Moscow: Nauka.
8. Reichstein, A. D. (1980). *Semantic reinterpretation and figurative meaning in language*. Moscow: Nauka.
9. Telia, V. N. (1996). *Russian phraseology: Semantic, pragmatic and linguocultural aspects*. Moscow: Languages of Russian Culture.